UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes, *Editor in Chief*

Louis L. Mann, Curtis W. Reese, *Associate Editors*

In Defense of Prophetic Ministry

By W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW

Freedom of Expression in the Church

By ELIOT WHITE

Force, Outlawry, and Peace

By SALMON O. LEVINSON

India and Her Struggle for Independence

By W. H. B.

VOLUME CX NUMBER 9

Chicago, November 14, 1932

PRICE TEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Weekly October to June — *Subscription $3.00*
Published Bi-Weekly July to September — *Single Copies 10 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, July 30, 1931, at the Post office at Chicago. Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor in Chief*
LOUIS L. MANN, CURTIS W. REESE, *Associate Editors*

Board of Directors
MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON, Treasurer
MRS. ELLA R. NAGELY
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
Secretary: MAY JOHNSON

Editorial Board
W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
RAYMOND H. PALMER
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors
LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Editorial Contributors
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
PERCY M. DAWSON
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
M. C. OTTO
FREDERICK STARR
JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND
JAMES H. WEST

Foreign Representatives
AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
CANADA—NORMAN STEWART DOWD
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL— Page
Notes 131
In Defense of Prophetic Ministry—W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW 133
Jottings—J. H. H. 134
ARTICLES—
Force, Outlawry, and Peace—SALMON O. LEVINSON 135
India and Her Struggle for Independence—W. H. B. 136
Freedom of Expression in the Church—ELIOT WHITE 139
POETRY—
City Comradeship—ANNA LOUISE STRONG 131
Trumpets on New Horizons:
Aviatrix—KATE BUTLER 140
Black Cross—ROSE ANDREWS 140
Via Jocosa—MARY OWEN LEWIS 140
Sky—BUTEAU SHOCK 140
Millennium—LINA M. KREACHBAUM 140
THE STUDY TABLE—
The Birth of the German Republic—TARAKNATH DAS 140
The War Racket—JAMES A. FAIRLEY 143
CORRESPONDENCE—
In Praise of Mr. Comfort—ELEANOR WARD 143
The Committee for Books for Political Prisoners 143
Words of Cheer: I. S. LUCHS 143
II. A. F. HUMISTON 143
Open Columns—HOMER LEWIS SHEFFER 143
THE FIELD—
Resolutions Passed at Geneva, October 6, 1932 130

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Resolutions Passed by the Conference on India, Held in Geneva, Switzerland, on October 6th, 1932

I. This International Conference of the Friends of India resolves by the following means to express its sympathy with and give its active cooperation to the cause of India by peaceful means. It stands for India's right of complete Self-Determination.

a. It establishes a permanent International Committee, whose title is "Comite International pour l'Inde" and whose tasks will be:

1. To collect and disseminate authentic information on India.
2. To co-ordinate the activities of organizations working in various countries for the same cause.
3. To take such other steps as may appear useful.

This Committee consists of:

1. A small executive.
2. Accredited representatives of adhering societies.
3. Patrons or well-known personalities willing to lend their moral support.

b. The Conference decides that the seat of the Committee will be Geneva for 1932 and 1933.

c. The Conference appoints the following Executive with power to cooperate. On its first sitting, on October 7th, the new Executive coopted three new members: Dr. F. O. Hefti, Mlle. Olga Birukoff and M. Alexandre Mairet, all of Geneva.

President: Dr. Edmond Privat, Geneva.

Hon. Secretaries: Mrs. E. Horup, Copenhagen; M. J. L. Claparède, Geneva; Mlle. Madeleine Rolland, France; Mme. Meyer-Stolte, Geneva. (These were all members of the Provisional Executive).

d. The Conference takes cognizance of the fact that the following organizations and groups have already chosen their permanent delegate in the Committee:

Danish Friends of India: Cathinka Olson (Denmark).

Amis de Gandhi: Mme. Guiyesse (France).

Ligue Pro-Hindoue: Roger Lievens (Belgium).

Bulgarian Friends of India: Evstati Statkoff (Bulgaria).

Gandhi-Briefe (for German speaking countries) Wermer Zimmerman (Switzerland).

Women's International League for Peace and Freedom: Mme. C. Drevet (Geneva), Miss E. Pye (London).

Theosophical Order of Service: Dr. Annie Kamensky (Geneva).

Trait d'Union: Jacques Demarquette (France).

Women's Indian Association: Mrs. Cousins (International Representative), Mrs. Haegler (London).

Fédération romande des Groups d'action pour la Paix: Mlle. Alice Descoeudres (Geneva).

(*Continued on page* 144)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CX MONDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 1932 Number 9

CITY COMRADESHIP

Face on face in the city, and when will the faces end?
Face on face in the city, but never the face of a friend,
Till my heart grows sick with longing and dazed with the din of the street,
As I rush with the thronging thousands in a loneliness complete.

Shall I not know my brothers? Their toil is one with mine.
We offer the fruits of our labor on the same great city's shrine.
They are weary as I am weary, they are happy and sad with me,
And all of us laugh together when evening sets us free.

Face on face in the city, and where shall our fortunes fall?
Face on face in the city—my heart goes out to you all.
See, we labor together, is not the bond divine?
Lo! the strength of the city is built of your life and mine.

ANNA LOUISE STRONG.

There is somewhere a saying to the effect that "man's extremity is God's opportunity." We have thought of this in connection with the present plight of our conservative friends, and the chance this gives the radicals to do a little talking. It seems to us that never have the radicals had such a chance to storm the citadels of reaction as today. A few years ago the reactionaries were "sitting pretty." They were riding the top of the wave, with all the tides of the universe sweeping them on to triumph. But now everything is changed—they are floundering helplessly in the trough of the sea. Their world, which they thought sustained by the very pillars of the universe, has suddenly cracked to pieces. Their ideas, which they thought backed by the tradition of the ages and by the will of God himself, have proved to be something worse than rubbish. Their minds, fastened on a realm of conquest and victory, are much like the mind of Napoleon at St. Helena. Tremendous things have happened, and they know not why. Their cosmos, so familiar and so friendly, is now all strange and fearful. They have lost confidence in themselves, these reactionaries! Everywhere are questions, and no answers—confusion, and no order. They are lost! And with this consciousness of loss, there comes a great humility, and a sudden desire to learn. The conservatives, in other words, are certain now that they do not know as much as they thought they did; and with this confession goes a curiosity about ideas and theories and philosophies which hitherto they have regarded as outlandish or dangerous, or both. It is this which explains the otherwise inexplicable interest in Soviet Russia even in the most stand-pat circles. It is this which gives the radical such an opportunity to present his programs of reform. A drowning man will not only examine but clutch at anything which promises to keep him afloat. Now is our chance to throw the sinking world the life-preserver of our hope.

We are beginning to learn, at this late period of history, what a "round table" conference really means. It apparently is a conference where men go 'round and 'round, and never get anywhere. This thought is suggested by the announcement that Premier MacDonald has called another round table conference to meet in London on the Indian question. This is the third meeting of the kind in recent years—which looks, in our American baseball parlance, like "three strikes and *out*"! What MacDonald thinks he is doing is hard to say. Perhaps he is just trying desperately to keep up appearances—to make a show of progress when the English situation in India is growing more appalling every hour. Perhaps, with his well-known delusion of grandeur, he is persuaded still that he can overawe the Indians, or, in the last resort, beat them down by sheer weight of royal authority. What he ought to know—*must* know, if he is sane—is that there is even less chance of this conference succeeding than there was of the earlier ones, which were flat failures. The National Congress, which is the center and soul of Indian life today, has absolutely boycotted the meeting, and not a single representative of the party will sit at the table. Already negotiations are under way to release Gandhi from prison—an obvious attempt to reproduce the performance of 1931, when Gandhi dealt with Lord Irwin as now the English would have him deal with Lord Wellington. But the Mahatma has had his lesson, and it is certain that he will be neither trapped nor persuaded into either attending or even endorsing this latest fiasco. Meanwhile, liberals of the Sastri school will once again make the pilgrimage to London, to be once again deceived. How naive these liberals are! India and not Britain is now the controlling center of Indian affairs; Gandhi and not MacDonald is the dominant personal figure. Let no one be deceived—the third

round table conference is a mere gesture as futile as it is foolish.

When "Al" Smith said in a campaign speech that it was the depression that had upset the public mind on Prohibition, he said—to quote his own elegant vocabulary—"a mouthful." The depression, surely, and not the so-called failure of Prohibition, was the real cause at work. Not that the 18th Amendment and its administration were any complete and perfect success! But the success was as great as any achieved in any far-sweeping reform of this drastic character, and would have been left to develop its ultimate triumph, had not the depression bewitched the nation with the idea of getting money out of mid-air by taxing "booze" (As though liquor revenues did not come out of the pockets of the people!). Recent evidence of the relative success of Prohibition is interesting. Thus, in the revenue measure passed by the last Congress, a tax was placed on malt and other ingredients used in the manufacture of "home brew." This was expected to bring millions of dollars into the Treasury, for is not brewing going on in every farm-house and in every city tenement? But now the first reports are in, and, lo and behold, the income from this source is only *one-tenth* of the official estimate. Which means that there is nine-tenths less home-brew in the nation than we had imagined. Again, the *Christian Century* reports that Scotch distillers are unable to dispose of their whiskey. In the single village of Rothes, for example, there is a warehouse containing 2,000,000 gallons. But why is this hoarded store of liquor not turned into the smuggled flood that we are told is pouring over our borders all the time? Can it be that the American coast-line is more successfully guarded than we have been told? Still again, the October issue of *Tide,* a business journal, tells of the great campaign that is now being prepared for the sale of "booze" in this country, when the Volstead Act is repealed and the 18th Amendment disposed of. "A new market of consumers must be created." What!—has not the market been made inexhaustible by Prohibition? Have we not all become "boozers"? These things are curious. The Amendment is perhaps a bigger success than we have imagined.

The decline of political oratory seems to us a lamentable feature of the times. We keep hearing of "great speeches," but have neither heard nor read any in this recent campaign. "Al" Smith's late entrance into the late electoral contest was hailed by the New York press as the return of "the most effective political speaker of his generation." But Smith never makes a speech, much less an oration. On the contrary, he enormously entertains his audiences with vaudeville monologues of the very first class. What we mean by oratory can be studied in the current biography of Albert J. Beveridge. The addresses of this remarkable man were carefully prepared works of art, with structure, style, symmetry, and all projected with a potency of personality which was overwhelming. William Jennings Bryan was of course an orator of the grand and classic type. His mind was not of the primary order, and his education was defective, but his genius for public speech was of incomparable range and power. Of this great tradition there is nothing left, save in the solitary case of Senator Borah, the last of the long line of American orators which began with Patrick Henry, continued through Webster, Sumner, Everett and Phillips, knew radiant glories in Robert G. Ingersoll, and now is all but gone. We believe that the radio is playing havoc with our speakers. Standing before a microphone, the victim forgets his audience in his consciousness of the machine, and thus misses all the fire of contact between person and person. But there are deeper causes at work—not only in oratory, but in acting and writing, and painting, and everything of an artistic nature. What we are losing is a sense of form —the "grand style," which lifts a man out of and above himself and makes him the medium of something akin to revelation. Naturalism has got us, at a time when nature is peculiarly petty, sordid, and dull. Perhaps when we feel again the impulse of service and catch again the vision of beauty, we will renew oratory, and the arts generally.

Talk about the influence of the movie still goes on and gets steadily more depressing. To what are we educating our youth, and what impression are we making upon foreign minds? This latter point becomes ever more important as the international problem, especially as between East and West, becomes ever more acute. Here comes a statement, for example, from Lord Irwin, Viceroy of India until 1931, friend of Gandhi and of the Indian people: "The prestige of the white man," he says, "standing for a higher life and morality has been almost entirely lost through the movie." Rev. Henry A. Stimson, well-known Congregational clergyman of New York, reports the following from an American in India:

> Not long ago a European was seated by a cultured Indian in a movie in India. They were strangers, but suddenly he turned to the other man and said with feeling, "I am an Indian. I suppose you white people would call me a 'nigger.' I am unacquainted with other sides of Western civilization, but what I have seen here tonight and on numerous other occasions in these places convinces me that the ordinary middle classes in America are the most depraved and immoral creatures any race or nation ever has produced."

The American reporting this incident adds:

> The revolting indecency and appalling vulgarity that are allowed to appear on the screen are making an appeal to the eye far more lasting and permanent than any appeal through the other senses. There is slight reason to believe that little, if any, censorship is exercised over the films sent here.

All this is nothing new. It has all been said before. It

has its good side, in that disgust at the movie civilization of the West must be one of the decisive influences making for the deliverance of the East from subservience to that civilization. But there is at bottom the deep, dark fact that the East is being taught fundamentally to misunderstand the West, and thus is being poisoned against that appreciation of East for West and West for East which, as Tagore is never tired of saying, must constitute the firm foundation of a united and peaceful world. To think of America as shown through the lens of Hollywood is enough to chill the blood with horror. What kind of a future are we building? Are the movies destined to be remembered not as a new art but as the final corruption of our day?

Is Saul among the prophets? Has Bernard Shaw become a pessimist? What is the exact significance of his last play, "Too True To Be Good," which the Theatre Guild last season presented in New York? The critics at that time seemed to be agreed that it is a bad play, with a foolish plot, incredible characters, and a dialogue prolix and all too often "flat, stale, and unprofitable." Apparently the mental and spiritual decline of the aging author, definitely forecast in the preface to "Back To Methuselah," and so long triumphantly postponed, has now at last arrived. But the critics also seemed to be agreed that this senile drama is amazingly impressive. Joseph Wood Krutch, in the *Nation,* confessed that, after witnessing "a trivial fable . . . preposterously managed," he none the less "left the theatre moved as I have seldom been moved by any theatrical performance." Old he may be, with most of his cunning gone, but for this reason, perhaps, Shaw has become honest and shown at last his heart. "Too True To Be Good" is evidently Shaw's farewell to the stage, and to his audience. After a generation of uncanny wit, brilliant satire, and apparently infallible insight into the troubles of the world and the woes of men, Bernard Shaw is driven to concede at last that it has been all for nothing. The world is headed for destruction—nothing can save it—preaching and playwriting are only so much idle talk. Even his own programs and policies, offered with such confidence through the years, have now apparently turned to dust and ashes. The sprightly enthusiasm engendered by his visit to Moscow a year ago last summer seems to be gone—at least, it does not appear. Bernard Shaw, in other words, if this latest play from his pen is to be trusted, has become completely disillusioned and pessimistic. Not even in Spengler can be found any more utter abandonment of hope than in this last testament of the author's muse. All of which may be only one more evidence of the unpredictable contrariness of Shaw, or else the most portentous sign and symbol of our collapsing world that has yet been seen!

In Defense of Prophetic Ministry

Some things in our present day life are not all to the good, among them being our impatience with and disapproval of a prophetic ministry. Professor Van Tyne of the University of Michigan, who has been making a study of the origin of the American Revolution, has discovered that seventy-five percent of the patriots who have attained distinction were members of the non-conformist churches. The ideas and phrases that were embodied in the resolutions and speeches, he finds, were taken directly from the sermons to which they listened. Where did Patrick Henry, he asks, get his radical opinion and fiery language? From his minister, of course! All the anti-monarchial convictions, the right of people to govern themselves, the inherent worth of every human life, the challenge of democracy, in short all the ideas, sentiments and convictions that surprised the English were the common, every day phrases of the Colonists. Thus, the revolution was the outworking of what the people had been taught from the pulpit.

Many concerned persons are feeling that in the present intellectual and social crisis, which of course is due to the influx of unassimilated facts and deepening convictions, that we are not getting the help from the pulpit which we have a right to expect. This may be due to the fact that the church is being used as a big booster club for every new fad and fancy that comes along. They feel that somebody must take hold of the new implications and point out their moral and ethical applications, or someone else will seize them and make immoral application of them.

This means that the minister must indeed be a prophet of truth who has learned the habit of thinking about the fundamentals of life. He must know the metaphysics that lie back of physics, the psychology that controls behavior and makes for character, and the philosophy that is the compass of conduct.

We are today in the midst of the greatest revolution of thought the world has ever known; the Einstein theory of relativity, the Planck theory of quanta, the chromosome theory of heredity, the hormone theory of temperament, the inductive study of history and our knowledge of social behavior—all these have made a new world. The ideas coming from these new conceptions are influencing, and will continue to influence, theology, philosophy, ethics, sociology, economics, standards and values of individual and social conduct more than the Copernican theory influenced those of the sixteenth century.

To be sure the prophet-preacher may not be able

to remember whether the Smith child is a boy or girl, whether Deacon Jones is the best golf or tennis player, or whether Mrs. Brown had her teeth pulled or her hair bobbed. There are plenty of good men in the world who can remember these things with an accuracy that puts an encyclopedia to shame. His business is to make bitter enemies as well as devoted disciples when he handles the great issues of life without the traditional ministerial silk gloves.

To be sure no man can do this unless he is thoroughly trained, and continues to be an untiring student. It is not wise to call him an expert on morality or ethics; but he most certainly should be an expert on the implications and applications of religion, and its demands upon the individual and society. Of course, if he is a subsidized parrot, or a patented phonograph to be taught or wound up by every community campaign or national drive to "whoop 'er up," he will be reduced to sounding brass and tinkling cymbal.

On the contrary, his job is two-fold: educational and inspirational. Unless he knows the facts implied in modern biology, for example, he will know only very little about the cure for sin in the old personal sense, and neither can he inspire men to any sort of conduct that will be consistent with the facts as modern biology reveals them. Even so if he does not know the facts involved in our economic and international problems he cannot inspire men to strive for any just and intelligent program of brotherhood founded upon goodwill which is born of good reason and good sense.

The new knowledge produced during the past fifty years is here to stay, the Fundamentalists, Security League and Manufacturers' League notwithstanding! It is rapidly becoming a part of our cultural life. And yet we have produced no theology and no philosophy that will relate and interpret these facts, many of them terrible and haunting, to the problems of individual and social behavior. But with the development of a prophetic ministry which will take these facts and dramatize, or emotionalize, or religionize them we will at length be able to direct the course of our human future by the flaming star of truth.

Conventional morality, like conventional ethics, is far below what it ought to be. When, for example, Jesus asked the conventionalists of his day that searching question, "What do ye more than they?" he flung out the challenge to the prophet-preacher. To chant the status-quo is not religion, whatever else it may be. Things are not necessarily right because they exist as they are. Slavery was not right because it existed, neither was witchcraft or duelling, and neither is the shameful injustice of our present order just because it exists. If people are merely to be patted on the back and told what fine folks they are when they go to church, then what is the use of their going? If that is the supreme object of church-going, then it resolves itself into an ego-flattering exercise. Unless folks go to church to find solutions for the haunting problems of life, whatever they may be, then the future boots ill indeed.

To be a prophet-preacher will cost something, perhaps very much indeed. It is no field for cowards or compromisers. To hunt lions in Africa requires less courage than to stalk them in the pews. But if a man loves folks the while he hates injustice and inhumanity, he has a fulcrum by which he can lift the world. It's a great challenge, but men of heroic mould will choose none other!

W. Waldemar W. Argow.*

*Mr. Argow, for some years among our Editorial Contributors, is now a member of our regular Editorial Board.—Editor.

Jottings

For the sake of the record—an article in the *Christian Century* (October 26th) on Gandhi's fast, "Gandhi Offers His Life," by C. F. Andrews! This article includes a remarkable letter by Gandhi not hitherto published. It should not be missed.

Radio City, or the Rockefeller Center, in New York, is one of the major tragedies of the age. Acres and acres of offices which nobody wants, theatres which nobody will attend, halls which nobody will enter, while thousands of homeless walk the streets, and thousands of families live in indecent tenements!

Before Hitler expels the Jews from Germany, he might well study what happened after Louis expelled the Huguenots from France. A transfusion operation strengthens the person into whose veins the rich red blood is poured, and weakens the person from whose veins that blood is drawn.

We are horrified to read of 20,000 persons killed annually in India by snake-bite. Yet this is only about two-thirds of the number killed annually in this country by automobiles, and our population is only one-third of the Indian total.

As we see the new Italian steamship, "Rex," sailing back and forth across the ocean, we are suddenly reminded that Italy has a king.

Ironies of Circumstance: (6)—that the pacifist Chinese were the inventors of gun-powder.

J. H. H.

Force, Outlawry, and Peace

[The following letter from Mr. S. O. Levinson, the father of the "Outlawry of War," to Lord David Davies, distinguished English peace advocate, is of wide and permanent interest. It is here published as an invaluable contribution to the general problem of war and peace. —Editor.]

My dear Lord Davies:

On my return to Chicago I find your letter of October first and copy of *The New Commonwealth* you kindly enclosed. . .

Your position (on international peace) is succinctly stated by Mr. Barnes in *The New Commonwealth* number you sent:

> The way to permanent peace is through the pursuit of justice, guarded by a supreme international authority with an overwhelming force at its disposal, ready to overrule all national forces.

This policy is in direct conflict with the philosophy and essence of the Outlawry of War. We never proposed to outlaw the institution of war by force. No institution was ever outlawed by force. Such a proposal is a contradiction in basic terms. Our procedure was to take out of the fiber of international law all recognition of war, and to renounce and make its use illegal, by a general treaty among the nations. We regarded war as a method of settling disputes and of establishing justice, right or title, an outworn institution, a relic of barbarism, which, in its progressive destructiveness, was gnawing at the very vitals of civilization itself.

Nor did we adopt this view or reach this decision as pacifists in the then orthodox meaning of the word. We were not opposed to the use of force in its proper sphere, as, for example, within a nation for purposes of law and order. We clearly distinguished both the propriety and workability of force exerted by a nation against its own individual citizens and inhabitants, and force attempted to be exerted upon a nation, an aggregation of people. For example, the United States government can imprison or put to death any one of its citizens for a serious breach of the peace or of criminal law; but the United States can not be imprisoned or put to death. This is perhaps even a more palpable truth than Burke's famous statement that you can not indict a whole people.

The use of force internationally, the setting up of a system of force for the purpose of accomplishing results and of imposing an alien will or penalties upon nations, is war under the seductive name of "sanctions." Likening it to force that is used within a nation for the maintenance of law and order is fallacious and wide of the mark. Sovereign force must exist within a nation to enforce domestic laws, to safeguard law-abiding citizens and the home, and to preserve the stability and integrity of the government itself. But the use of force to determine right and title or to establish justice within its borders has not for more than a century been recognized by any civilized nation.

There are two primary and fundamental objections to the institutional use of force between nations:

1. It is wrong, cruel, and destructive.
2. It does not work, and if it seems to work for a while—as in the Franco-German war of 1870—it is seen in another generation not to work. And the World War "worked" only in terms of universal destruction.

The mere concept of an international major force is a frightful nightmare. It is confusion worse confounded. It would be considered, and resisted, by any nation or set of nations against whom it is directed as international tyranny and brutal injustice. Let us suppose that in this grandiose world scheme Great Britain was declared to be the "aggressor" and this international Geneva force was turned full blast on her—and let us suppose that Great Britain successfully resisted this force—would we give in, or would we not supplement and pyramid this international force so as in the end to crush and destroy Great Britain? Obviously the same thing can be applied to most nations, although it is difficult to visualize it against a nation like Russia, or the United States, because of their size and isolated geography. But the principle is the same.

In the international sphere, the law of nations, public opinion and their sustaining moral force are as far as the nations should go. The exercise of force to coerce or punish a nation is plain war and can never be anything else.

Japan is not happy over her situation. She continues to send eloquent diplomatic missionaries to the United States to persuade public opinion away from its rooted views on Manchuria. Sooner or later Japan will have to give way in Manchukuo just as she did in the seizure of Shantung. The arts of peace must be applied to the two sister Mongolian nations; their destinies can not be worked out, nor their problems solved, by the stern exercise of force. It may satisfy temporary indignation, prejudice or passion, but it furnishes no final or proper solution.

In my opinion the solidarity of practically all the nations of the world in morally condemning the action of Japan in Manchuria and Shanghai, plus the splendid Lytton report thereon, is the greatest triumph for peace and pacific measures in the annals of history. Just as the ninety pound Gandhi, by sheer power of his spiritual courage succeeded with Britain and India where a thousand battleships would have failed.

From the foregoing you can see that much as I would like to join in the movement of *The New Commonwealth,* whose ultimate objective is near to my heart, I can not do it without sacrificing the most fundamental conviction I have on the subject of war and peace. We must thoroughly educate the masses of the people in all countries to realize that their governments have renounced, abolished and outlawed war as a method of adjusting disputes, and that it is their business to see to it that their governments live up to the treaties they have signed. Public opinion, not guns, will make the outlawry treaty the greatest boon ever bestowed upon the human family.

I may add that it is this question of "sanctions," this doctrine of compulsion by force, that has caused the greatest schism in the peace ranks of this country. Indeed, it was Article X, plus Articles XVI and XVII of the League of Nations covenant, that kept the United States out. There were other objections but those were the salient ones in 1919, the guarantee of force, the commitments to the use of overwhelming sanctions, that turned the tide in this country against entering the League. Your program would be not only

to retain these articles of force in the covenant but to raise them to the nth power and to create for their effectuation what would inevitably become a superstate of force under the guidance of God-knows-what combination of nations from time to time.

SALMON O. LEVINSON.

India and Her Struggle for Independence*

History informs us, that during the reign of Akbar the Great in the sixteenth century, India was peaceful and prosperous and therefore happy. Following this great ruler's death, the country became divided into various factions, forming separate states, each state being governed by a native prince. This arrangement not working out satisfactorily, the nation in consequence became demoralized through incessant warfare among the different tribes or castes. It was about this time that the East India Company was formed, under that enterprising young man Robert Clive, the British in this way, eventually securing a hold on this unhappy country, which they have held tenaciously ever since.

It is to be admitted that the British have made many improvements in this country, but in my humble estimation, they have not done enough to alleviate the sufferings of the common people, because when I went there, I found nothing but poverty, misery and wretchedness. One thing I noticed in particular, namely, the general attitude of the white people towards the natives, this was such as to create little love in the hearts of the Indian people for the white race, and I am sure there are many who agree with me in that respect. The following incidents are given for illustration:

One day, when I was marching along a certain public thoroughfare in the beautiful city of Bangalore, S. India, along with my Company, our Captain being in charge of the party, a poor old man, a native, decided to cross the street just as we were about to pass. The poor old fellow becoming somewhat confused, as old people do sometimes, made the mistake of trying to turn back, instead of crossing, which he could have done in perfect safety. In attempting to turn back, he collided with the officer, who, instead of taking the old man by the arm and leading him across the street, struck him on the face with his walking-stick. Not content with this, he kicked him out of the way, the old man crying for mercy. To have interfered, and I was strongly tempted to do so, the result for me would have been probably five years in prison for striking an officer of the British Army. As it was, I was restrained by two of my comrades, who were older men and had more experience than I had in the Army. I was only eighteen years of age at the time, but this incident made a lasting impression upon me, and I commenced to take the more interest in the natives and the country than I had done before. Incidentally, I might mention, this same officer was killed by one of his own men somewhere in France during the Great War, and I was not at all surprised to hear it.

The next incident I am going to describe, was when I was connected with the Government Dairy Farm Service at Kirkee, near Poona, where Mahatma Gandhi is now imprisoned for his activities in connection with the Nationalist movement for Complete Independence. My daily duties on the Farm generally commenced with a tour of inspection of the several departments in my care. Commencing with the dairies, then the stores, I would finish with the cattle-yards, the whole taking about an hour, when I would return to my office. One morning as I was leaving the house on my way to the dairies, I was surprised to hear sounds of a commotion emanating from the direction of the Godown or stores, where the grain and supplies were kept. In front of the warehouse, or Godown, I noticed a large automobile of expensive make standing, and in it, comfortably seated, was a white lady of large proportions and a very majestic air, evidently enjoying seeing India through a lorgnette. On my arrival on the scene, the lorgnette was immediately leveled in my direction and I was subjected to a very close inspection by the lady. My appearance evidently proving satisfactory, the lady completely ignored my polite salutation, but turned away and continued seeing India. Feeling somewhat embarrassed at the lady's lack of courtesy, I continued on my way and was about to enter the warehouse, when out came about twenty of my men carrying a huge packing-case or crate between them. This case, I found out later, contained household effects. The natives were terribly excited, all yelling and screaming at the pitch of their voices, while running around them, like a man bereft of his senses, was a white man in civilian attire. He was kicking a native here, punching one there, now and again relieving the monotony of this by soundly cuffing one on the side of the head. During all this performance, he kept up a storm of abuse in Hindustani, using epithets I would hate to translate. At one end of the crate I noticed poor old Merceenie, my faithful storekeeper, an elderly Mohammedan whom I greatly loved and respected, not only as a servant, but as a friend. One old enough to be my father. Seeing him receive a violent kick, which almost laid him on the ground, I decided to interfere—which I promptly did. Tapping the white gentleman lightly on the shoulder with my riding crop, I quietly asked him his name and business. He produced a card bearing the name of Colonel ————, whereupon I politely informed him I would be extremely obliged if he would refrain from at least kicking and abusing the natives, many of whom were trusted servants of the same Government of which he was an official. His reply was a storm of abuse and to end what might have proved to be an embarrassing scene, I ordered the coolies to return to their respective duties, which they immediately did, leaving the huge crate at the side of the road, to the mortification of the Colonel, who, I could plainly see was ready to compromise.

Knowing this officer would undoubtedly report me to my superiors, and that in all probabilities, it would mean the end of my career with the Government Dairy Farms, I decided to end the matter as I had began. Turning to the Colonel, I informed him he was at perfect liberty to remove his belongings at any time,

*The author of this article is an Englishman now living in America. He lived in India "for several years as a soldier and also in the Government Dairy Farm Service."—Editor.

but unless I received written instructions from my superiors, I could not permit him or anyone else to use Government labor or transportation. For the removal of the crate he had commandeered one of the farm bullock-carts, which I, of course had had returned to the cattle-yard. The Colonel thereupon got into his car in high dudgeon and drove off, no doubt mentally consigning me to a warmer place than Kirkee. The following day, I received written instructions from my superiors to have the Colonel's belongings forwarded to the nearest railway-station, and that was all. I had expected to be court-martialed for the affair, although I was prepared for that should it have taken place, and I knew I was in the right.

The incidents just mentioned are examples of how the average white man in India treats the natives. I know of many others. No wonder such a hatred exists between the two races. Everything seems to be wrong in this unhappy country, and as far as I can see, the native has little or no incentive to improve himself. Education there is for a few, but schools are certainly in the minority. For over two hundred years, India has been held in subjection by the supremacy of the British, and what do we find today? She is economically undeveloped, agriculturally ancient in her methods of production, while industrially she is more or less hampered by the presence of the white man. If one were to ask an Indian why he does not try to improve himself, the answer might be put in this way. "Does the slave improve under the rod of the master?"

Discipline we all know is absolutely essential for the preservation of law and order among the masses, without it life would be impossible, there is no doubt about that. The British, however, have their own interpretation of the word discipline, witness the Amritsar incident of 1919, when a certain General of the British Army ordered his men to fire upon a crowd of peaceful Indian citizens, killing them by the hundreds without any provocation whatsoever. This was done simply to instill into the minds of these poor people that might was right. I understand these people had assembled together to hold a religious festival, also to discuss the affairs of the country, humbly and quietly, a very natural thing to do considering the state the country was in. As for arms of any kind, I am told by a most reliable person, there was not a single weapon in the crowd, not even a pocket knife, so that there could be nothing but peaceful intentions on the part of the gathering. In Great Britain when a great crowd of people assembles, and it is found necessary to send for the police or the Militia in order to preserve the peace, I might mention that before a single shot is fired, the mayor of the town or city must first of all read what is termed the Riot Act three times, and urge the people to disperse. No such thing was done at Amritsar. General Dyer simply fired upon the crowd without any warning of any kind, boasting afterwards that there would have been twice the number of casualties had he been able to get machine guns on the scene.

Innocent women and children were sacrificed ruthlessly that day, the same children that Christ included when he said, "Suffer the little children to come unto me for of such is the Kingdom of Heaven." After this terrible affair, the General was recalled home and presented with a sum of money, ten thousand pounds, I believe the sum was, *for quelling the riots at Amritsar*. I am not a Hindu, I am not a Mohammedan, I am a Christian, but what does that matter? as we all hope to enter Paradise, no matter what road we travel, provided we do that which is right and just to our fellow men. I wonder what religion General Dyer believes in? and whether he has ever heard the words, "Do unto others, as ye would be done by," and if he expects to enter Paradise as well as the rest of us? because he is nothing but a cold-blooded murderer in the sight of God and man. As I said before, this gallant officer and so called gentleman was afterwards recalled home, the usual procedure in such cases, you will observe I use the word cases, as a repetition of this affair was enacted a few years later at Peshawar, only perhaps on a larger scale, as in this instance, the British used armored cars to mow down the masses. Such atrocities are not likely to create love in the hearts of the Indian people, rather the reverse.

Although it is over sixteen years since I left India, as far as possible, I have endeavored to keep myself posted as to the recent developments of the Independence Movement by the reading of books, newspapers and magazines. Sometimes this information has been rather meager, due to the fact that all literature is, as you know, strictly censored by the British authorities. However, for the years I have spent in India, I have this to say, they were the most interesting, if not the happiest of my life. I was not blind to the sufferings of a people, who were once upon a time a great nation, and who, if they have fallen, have done so through no fault of their own, because they had no incentive to do otherwise. Whatever Great Britain has done for India, she has been more than paid in return. India does not owe her anything, I would say that the boot is on the other foot. I do not know of any other country in the world where the people are taxed fifty-per cent of their earnings, and I certainly do not know of any other country where they are so poorly paid as they are in India.

Britain, slowly awakened to the fact that the people of India were beginning to realize their lot in life was not all that it should be, decided something must be done, to stop the clamoring for freedom which could be heard from every throat in the country. Sir John Simon was selected to visit the country along with a group of men, to study conditions. I was greatly interested in the findings of this so-called Simon Commission. It was nothing more than a farce, a waste of time and money. A few of the members of this Commission may have known a little about India and the Indian people, but the majority of them knew nothing, and what is more, cared less. One English paper classified the Simon plan as follows: "Not Independence, nor yet Dominion Status, but an elastic, all India Federation, to foster progressive realization of responsible government, under British administration." Or in other words, Great Britain has no intentions of losing India altogether, if she can possibly hold on to it. However, the road is long, and the night is dark, much may happen in the process of time.

Only two things could possibly happen to this unhappy country, either she would continue to live in this state of bondage or degradation, thereby losing in the course of time everything she has in the way of culture or philosophy, or be reclaimed by a deliverer. God, our Heavenly Father, the Great Ruler of the

Universe, has sent this unhappy and unfortunate race of people, such a deliverer in the person of a little man they call Mahatma Gandhi, whose full name is Mohandass Karamchand Gandhi, Mahatma meaning "Holy One" or Saint. Mr. Gandhi is one of the most talked of persons in the whole world today, and is one of the finest examples of spiritual humanity that ever lived. Even the little children in the schools of America know who Gandhi is, he has made such a name for himself and his country. I have the greatest respect and admiration for this little man. His name will go down in history as being one of the greatest men the world has ever known, because he has proved to his oppressors, not his enemies because Gandhiji has no enemies, that war in general is unnecessary, and that one need not resort to violence and bloodshed to secure one's rights. He has ably demonstrated this religion of his "Ahimsa" or Non Violence. Even when the British guns were mowing down the masses, his fellow countrymen and their women and children, Gandhi pleaded with them to believe in the words "Love one another," and while not a Christian, I know he has a great respect for the Christian religion.

Mahatma Gandhi has done a remarkable thing, he has restored the manhood of India, enabling them to have the courage of their own convictions. He has pointed out to them that they have the ability to think and act as other men. He has restored their faith in their own race. In other words, Mr. Gandhi has awakened that, which has been more or less dormant for the past two centuries. Today, the cry of Mother India is "India for the Indians" and who can say she is wrong? Personally, I think she is perfectly justified in thinking so, and I do not stand alone in that respect.

During the time Gandhiji was in London, he made many friends, although I am told by a friend who was in London during Mr. Gandhi's visit, that the press was decidedly against him. That, of course, was to be expected. As for the two Round Table Conferences, I might mention that this great gathering of distinguished people, did nothing to make any material difference to the people of India, simply because the majority of the members represented the wealthier classes of India, the others (with the exception of Mr. Gandhi and his party) mere figure-heads, ready to answer in the affirmative any suggestion put to them by the wily and diplomatic British.

I have just been reading a book entitled, "India on Trial," written by a Mr. Wollacott who is, I presume, a Britisher, as the book is decidedly biased and strongly favors the British point of view throughout, especially when reference is made to the Complete Independence movement for India. However, in this same book, there are many interesting points to be observed, and doubtless the writer was sincere when he wrote them. I note what this gentleman says in answer to the oft-repeated question, "Why has Great Britain failed to do more for the people of India than she has done during the past two hundred years?" The reply was something like this: "Great Britain would have done more for the people of India than she has done, but was prevented by obstacles placed in her path, by the many religious scruples and superstitions of the common people." From my experiences in this unhappy country I would say that that statement of Mr. Wollacott's is far from being the truth, and instead of saying that Britain was prevented from doing more than she has done for the people of India, I would not be far wrong if I were to say that Great Britain has *profited* by the many religious scruples and superstitutions of the common people. In a land, such as India, where there are many religions and many languages, naturally there must be a great deal of friction, but at the same time, I would like to point out this outstanding fact. The reports one hears about the terrible scenes and spilling of blood between the Hindus and the Mohammedans are grossly exaggerated, and I am thoroughly convinced after hearing the eloquent and intellectual Dr. Haridas T. Muzumdar on this subject, that Gandhiji has brought the two races closer together than ever they were before. This brilliant young man is a splendid example of Indian manhood and one who has done much for his beloved country. I wish him, with all my heart and soul, every success in his heroic efforts to obtain freedom for his unhappy people. Much has been said about the inability of India to rule and govern herself, but if such a country can produce such men as Gandhi, Dr. Muzumdar and many others, there is no fear but what she is qualified to look after her own affairs. India should be given every opportunity to point out to the world that she is quite capable of looking after her own interests, instead of which, she is kept down by the rule of the "iron hand." Great Britain is only deceiving herself when she shouts to the world that she is only in India for the good of the people. From my own personal observations whilst in the country India appeared to me to be nothing but a playground for the sons of broken-down British aristocrats. The majority of the Europeans were not there through mere inclination either, but in the majority of cases, were there through greed, very few through actual necessity. No doubt some of them did prosper and become great men, but I have seen many who fell by the wayside, both morally and spiritually.

When I was in India the treatment meted out to the natives by the whites was most degrading, so much so there were times when I was ashamed of my own race. In several instances when I have personally interfered, the result was most humiliating and being only a subordinate, naturally I had no prestige and was compelled to suffer in silence. But if things were bad in India when I was there, over sixteen years ago, what are they today? Ten thousand times worse. Not only are the British shooting the people of India down, they are clubbing them to death, trying to club the reawakened manhood, which Gandhiji restored, out of their very souls, and yet we call ourselves Christians. Gandhi has held his people up to now with his passive resistance measures, but can he do so much longer? I am afraid not. There is a limit to everything, and the people of India have about reached the end of their endurance. Just what is the outcome of this Reign of Terror, now being enacted in India? Does it mean that the British are now beginning to realize that their day is done in India, or everywhere else for that matter? Yes, Britain's day in India *is* over, and I may never live to see India free, but I *know* she is going to be free *some day*.

Today, it is said, there are over 50,000 Indian Nationalists, men, women and even boys, in prison as a result of their activities in connection with the Independence movement for their country. The finest

brains of the country, and there are five times that number ready to take their place, if need be. Since it is impossible to imprison the whole of the Indian population can the great Churchill (who is a strong believer in using the sword, to promote peace in India) tell us what his hirelings will do when they run out of prisons? If he cannot answer this question, perhaps his *recently acquired* friend and colleague Mr. Ramsay MacDonald will be able to enlighten him.

I am very sorry indeed to hear that Mr. MacDonald may lose his sight, which is man's greatest blessing. At one time I was a great admirer of this statesman, that of course was before he changed his views in regard to the Indian question. Since then, he reminds me of the words of the immortal Burns, and incidentally a countryman of his and mine, who during a fit of despondency, wrote these words:

> Man's inhumanity to man—Makes countless thousands mourn.

I am very sorry indeed for Ramsay MacDonald, but I am also sorry, more than sorry, for the half-starved, downtrodden people of "Mother India." A people who were famous long before the British nation was ever heard of. Mr. MacDonald is a very great man today, but he would have been far greater in the sight of his Creator had he delivered the people of India from their bondage when he had the opportunity, an opportunity which will never again knock at his door.

W. H. B.

Freedom of Expression in the Church

Some may react to this title like the farmer at the circus who is alleged to have exclaimed at first sight of a giraffe—"There's no such animal!"

But that there is not more freedom of expression in the modern church, is largely the fault of the timid members who refuse to speak out and take the consequences. Real liberty of opinion and the voicing of it will never be handed to them on the proverbial "silver platter." They must find courage to claim it, and unitedly stand fast in behalf of it.

According to all ecclesiastical reactionaries, ideal clergymen resemble the slats of a Venetian blind. Authority pulls a cord. The whole row of those controlled by it obediently respond by slanting all one way. Let a lone minister express any but the prescribed opinions and he is, under such officialism, "in for trouble" at once. Plain are the warnings he receives to get back into the properly Venetian blind condition—or, Woe unto him!

The writer knows a clergyman who asked the editor of his denominational paper why he never criticized the amassing of the enormous fortune possessed by a certain leading layman. The editor replied that if Mr. —— should take offence at such fault-finding so that he cancelled his contributions to the foreign work of the denomination, it would necessitate the recall of more than two hundred of its missionaries from their posts. Freedom of expression? It is more like an obituary of it.

The highest dignitary of another church body recently accepted an invitation (during one of the world's worst years of economic and industrial depression), to travel to foreign lands with a leading banker, in the latter's luxurious private yacht. But that was by no means an unpaid-for excursion. Is it likely that the prelate will ever feel free to express convictions unwelcome to that magnate's political and economic tenets?

Subtle but nearly irresistible is the influence upon a clergyman's thought and action, of material wealth and comfort. The medieval perils of being burned at the stake or twisted on the rack had a stiffening effect on many a prophet's resolution. But soft rugs and swift limousines, private art collections and suave butlers, refined cuisine and fragrant cigars, are far deadlier weapons against the modern prophet's faithfulness to truths that are disagreeable to his lavish entertainers.

Upon such controversial issues as the ownership of the sources of wealth, militarism and pacifism, birth control, reform of divorce and alimony procedure, eugenics, Socialism and Communism, the resultant psychology inside all the churches is still too largely infantile and cowardly. Facts and clamant truth must be twisted and evaded, if not wholly suppressed. The financial and industrial rulership of the time must not be challenged. The minister is earnestly and paternally counselled to leave all such matters to the wise vestrymen or elders—they will "take care of them." Real independence is rare and costly as any Koh-i-noor.

At the wedding feast of Cana, Mary the mother of Jesus said to the servants, "Whatsoever he saith unto you, do it." Capitalism says, "Whatsoever *I* say unto you, do it." Which bidding is the modern minister to choose? He cannot possibly obey both.

He is urged by his prominent laymen to confine his preaching to "the simple Gospel." But that means among other subversive Bible messages, that he must proclaim God's purpose to "put down the mighty from their seats and exalt them of low degree." Mary, the mother of the Saviour so declared at the news of his coming birth. But such a song is straight revolution—no less! It is a Christian Marseillaise. And yet to what a scrannel piping it is thinned by most modern preachers!

"Freedom of expression in the church"? The pioneers exercise it, suffer for it, and save their own and others' souls alive. But those clergymen who, like human four-wheel brakes, are swift to respond to the chauffeurs of the profit system, repudiate such freedom, and are rewarded with the gewgaws of comfort and flattery. Yet underneath the soft raiment of body and spirit they despise their own subservience all the while.

The call is a clarion one today for new prophets and truthtellers. Revival of real religion is at hand. To those who can see beyond denominational barriers, the modern world is catching fire with increasing brotherhood and passion for reality. Even the disillusioned will honor the unflinching message-bearers to parasitic wealth of its speeding doom, and to the suffering exploited multitudes in our time, of the Kingdom of the revolutionary Christ of righteousness and unbounded love now at our very gates!

Jesus promised: "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." But let those who seek so great a treasure as that freedom, be clearly forewarned that the cost of its winning has never yet been accommodated to the resources of either timidity or compromise.

ELIOT WHITE.

Trumpets on New Horizons

Aviatrix

A woman flew over the broad Atlantic.
She conquered the sea and conquered the air;
Her ocean, the raging billows of sorrow,
Her clouds, the gloom of pain and despair.

Not the first or the only one to fly over.
Then no one will herald her; no one will write
Her praises, but look! on her face it is written,
All clearly, the tale of her glorious flight.

With only her faith for a compass to guide her,
Invincible courage carried her through.
Would you know her name, the street and the number?
Look around you; she may live in your house with you.

KATE BUTLER.

Black Cross

Humanity, all crushed and torn
At the feet of greed, has only scorn
For, gorged on human sacrifice,
The beast is drunk on blood and vice.

The milk is dry in shrunken veins
But greed ignores the mothers' pains;
This craven beast with noxious breath
Is grimly doing man to death.

ROSE ANDREWS.

Via Jocosa

On bracket of iron and wooden bench
Against the gray of walls,
They hang the mellow chrysanthemums
And burn on the flower stalls
The fire of leaves and bittersweet,
The crimson, scarlet, rose.
Viburnum berries redden the grill,
As if on a branch that grows.
Along the narrow, sober street,
November makes more gray,
The flower vendors' wayside shrines
Are stations where I pray.

MARY OWEN LEWIS.

Sky

The sky
Is a blue slate
Where the hand of God writes
Lessons of faith that are erased
By man.

BUTEAU SHOCK.

Millennium

I laid my head upon the ground,
Intent to dream the hour around . . .
But suddenly the flinty sound

Of whispers turned my calm to fear . . .
The ages spoke within my ear;
The Infinite was very near.

I heard the dead of war arise;
I heard the living utter cries,
For Justice to unbind her eyes.

I heard the slaves of kings recite
The Creed of Man and then unite
And slay the serpent arm of might.

I heard them all deny decay . . .
The billions who have turned to clay;
The rebel hearts that beat today.

My spirit rose and found their stride,
Kinspeople moved on every side . . .
Mankind shall not be long denied!

LINA M. KREACHBAUM.

The Study Table

The Birth of the German Republic[1]

I

The German Republic is the product of the World War and a revolution. This fact is well recognized by all students of history. Was the Constitution of the German Empire founded by Bismarck in 1871 any way responsible for the revolution? To what extent did internal party politics aid the cause of a German Revolution? Was the German Revolution a result of the unsuccessful war (1914-1918) which caused unspeakable suffering for the masses? Was the German army defeated because of the revolution, which the German nationalists term as "the stab at the back by the socialist traitors"? What were the causes of the defeat of Germany in the World War? Was the policy of Pan-Germans in rejecting a "peace without annexations and indemnities" a vital factor in the defeat of the German army? What part did the Kaiser play in shaping German policies—military, civil as well as international—during the World War? What part did the Reichstag play in controlling the German government? What was the attitude of political parties on various vital issues during the World War? How much power did the German chancellors wield? What was the real position of various chiefs of the General Staff of Germany? Was there a military dictatorship in Germany under General Ludendorff? What led to the abdication of Kaiser Wilhelm II? How did the final collapse of the German Empire come about? These are some of the pertinent questions which should be carefully considered in a study of the founding of the German Republic.

Dr. Arthur Rosenberg, Extraordinary Professor at Berlin University, who was a member of the Reichstag Committee of Inquiry into Germany's collapse in the World War, in his work, "The Birth of the German Republic" has answered all these questions and has given a valuable and objective exposition of the whole subject. The book is well-documented with references of great value; and it is an unbiased and scientific study. It throws light on weaknesses of political parties in Germany, and demolishes many historical untruths. It is an invaluable but concise work for those who wish to have an adequate grasp on various underlying causes of the German Revolution of 1918.

II

Revolutions are expressions of radical changes caused by social forces in a country, quickened into action by world forces. Emancipation of Germany after the fall of Napoleon, the unsuccessful revolution of 1848-49, the establishment of the German Empire in 1871, are land-marks of the march of events leading to the German Revolution of 1918, which in its turn may be a stepping-stone for another revolution of more radical character.

The efforts of 1848-49 on the part of the German

1. The Birth of the German Republic," by Dr. Arthur Rosenberg (translated from the German by Ian F. D. Morrow). New York, Oxford University Press: 1931. Pages 286 (with index). $3.50.

middle class to establish a united Germany under a parliamentary government failed because the middle class, which took the leadership of the revolution and which was supported by a section of the working people, was not strong enough to combat the power of the monarchy supported by the feudal lords, the agrarian, the military, the dynastic and bureaucratic, and even the clerical elements in the old order in Germany.

In 1871 Bismarck (a realist politician of conservative socialist tendencies), in establishing the German Empire, tried to reconcile the middle class with the old ruling forces by means of a clever compromise, to achieve national unity through the co-operation of the two, and at the same time to raise a strong bulwark against the "Red" revolution. In this compromise was the seed of the revolution of 1918, because, although the vast masses of the working class, some of the peasantry, and a few of the nobility followed the middle class political philosophy of liberalism, yet the Prussian army, the king, the corps of officers, the hierarchy of the Prussian bureaucracy, the great territorial magnates were not anxious to give up any of their vested interests and special privileges. For a time Bismarck tried to harmonize the conflicting interests of various groups through his personal influence, but it did not have any permanent effect in bringing about a genuine national unity among the German people. Even before the fall of Bismarck the Conservatives, the National Liberals, the Clerical Centre, and the Social Democrats had serious clashes on party lines. After careful analysis of "Social Forces Under Bismarck," Prof. Rosenberg comes to the conclusion that

The working-class supporters of the Centre (Catholic Party) were in principle as deeply opposed to the governmental system of Prussian-Germany as were the Social Democrats. Any one who studies the situation in 1890 from the standpoint of the consequences it was inevitably bound to bring in its train attains to a realization of the historic inevitabilty of the Revolution in 1918. (p. 23.)

Bismarckian foreign policy after 1871 was based upon the full realization of the fact that the German Empire could not maintain its existence by following a policy which would lead to a war with various Powers. In spite of an Austro-German alliance, Bismarck retained the confidence, if not the friendship of Russia, by checking Austrian aggressive policy in the Balkans. But with the fall of Bismarck, German foreign policy brought about a new alignment of powers which led to the World War, the fore-runner of the German Revolution of 1918.

At the outbreak of the World War, all political parties of Germany adopted a policy of truce (*burgfrieden*) with the express purpose of aiding the government and the military authorities. It can be safely asserted and has been conclusively proven by Prof. Rosenberg that there was not a defeatist movement in Germany among the Socialists, or radicals. The Socialists of Germany were for a "German victory." The following will give the idea behind this attitude:

In the nineties of the last century Engles foresaw the Franco-Russian war against Germany and had formed the following opinion about it. Germany was not only the land of the Hohenzollerns but also the home of the strongest and best organized Socialist workmen in the world. Hence an attack upon Germany was simultaneously an attack upon the Socialist German workman. Thus the interests of the Socialist International demanded a German victory. Obviously it was the duty of German workmen to take care that the war led to a Russian revolution and at the same time that France should not be ravaged by a victorious Germany. The war would have the effect of strengthening the power of the working class in Germany to an extraordinary degree and, if it ended successfully, would make clear the path for the victory of Socialism in Germany. Frederick Engles also desired that in a European War the working class in each of the great states should work each in their own way for a common aim, i. e., the German workmen for a German victory, but with their own special war aims and not those of German capitalists; the Russian workmen for the Russian revolution; the French workmen for a speedy conclusion of peace with Germany without mutual financial or territorial sacrifices. (pp. 74-75.)

It is interesting to note that although the German workmen adopted the policy of German victory, they were opposed to imperialist war and favored peace by negotiation. They were opposed to the Pan-Germans who were for "peace by victory and conquest." The German Social Democrats and middle class parties in the Reichstag, at the time of the World War, lacked the "will to power" and thus they failed to acquire new political rights. They were not in favor of the overthrow of monarchy, but they demanded parliamentary form of government and change of the "three class system" in Prussia.

Theoretically the Kaiser, as the Supreme War Lord of Germany, had unlimited powers in matters of army and state; but in practice, especially during the World War, he did not exert any personal influence and was content to leave military affairs in the hands of the German General Staff which in its turn used its influence over the civil government in an extraordinary manner. In fact the German chancellors, during the World War, were mere puppets of the German General Staff and its chief. This being the case, efficiency and political sagacity on the part of the chiefs of German General Staff were of utmost importance in regard to the German internal and international situation during the World War.

General von Moltke, who was the Chief of the German General Staff at the beginning of the World War, according to Prof. Rosenberg, was a man who was not fitted for this position of supreme importance. He was a very cultivated and highly sensitive gentleman, but he was incapable of carrying on war against France, England, Russia and other countries at the same time. The defeat of the Germans in the first battle of the Marne was due to the miscarriage of the famous "Schlieffen Plan." According to this plan,

. . . a weak German army was stationed in east Prussia to support the Austrians in their resistance to the Russians. The mass of the German army marched westward through Belgium in order to overthrow the enemy forces by means of an outflanking movement from the north. In order that the German armies should be able to resist the threatening Russian attack, it was necessary that the decisive battle in the west should be fought and won within six weeks. The opposing forces on the Western front were numerically about equal, since in the first few weeks of the war the French were only supported by one hundred thousand English soldiers and a few Belgian divisions. Thus far Moltke proceeded in accordance with Schlieffen Plan. *But he ruined any possible success that might have resulted from its employment by leaving almost a third of the German army in Alsace-Lorraine, where they could have no share in the combat.* (p. 80.)

It would seem that Moltke allowed himself to be influenced by political considerations in departing from the strict letter of the Schlieffen Plan. He kept large German forces in Alsace-Lorraine to prevent French soldiers from entering German soil. This was a mistake. The French General Joffre allowed the Germans

to enter French soil to bring about an ultimate defeat of the Germans. The result of the first battle of the Marne has been recorded by Prof. Rosenberg in the following manner:

> The German army—thanks to faulty leadership—did not even gain tactical victory it deserved from its fight on the Marne. While the German army proved itself at least equal of its opponents in the battle of the Marne, the victory lay with the enemy owing to intellectual superiority of the French over the German Headquarters Staff. When the extent of the disaster became clear to him General von Moltke suffered a complete breakdown and had to be relieved of his command. (p. 83.)

According to Prof. Rosenberg the German General Staff, until the advent of the Hindenburg-Ludendorff leadership in the eastern front and later on the western front, did not show any special sign of genius. Prof. Rosenberg makes it clear that Ludendorff was the genius, and he for two years was the real dictator of Germany. As a military leader, he was a great man; but as a politician he belonged to the Pan-German group. He stood in the way of any settlement of the war by a policy of concession or negotiation. Of course, he was convinced that the Allied Powers would not make a compromise peace. It was Ludendorff who forced the policy of unrestricted submarine warfare as a measure which might have aided the cause of German victory. He opposed the declaration of absolute independence of Belgium and thus practically frustrated the peace move made by the Pope. He was opposed to make any concession towards Parliamentary form of Government in Germany. He not only dictated to the German chancellor, but to the Kaiser, about internal and external policies of Germany.

The people did not revolt against Ludendorff's dictatorship, because they hoped that he would be able to bring peace soon by defeating the enemies of Germany. At one time it was possible for Ludendorff to win peace through victory, but he lost this opportunity because of his ambition for German expansion in the east, even to the borders of the Caucasus. After the defeat of the Russians, if Ludendorff had followed the policy of "peace without annexation and indemnity," he might have made an alliance with the Russians which would have enabled the Germans to use their full force in the western front against the allied force, before the millions of American soldiers took the battlefield against Germany. To promote the fantastic and Pan-German political programme of German expansion towards the Baltic and southern Russia, Ludendorff had to leave on the eastern fronts about one million German soldiers, even after the defeat of the Russian army. The treaties of Brest-Litovsk and Bucharest were no less imperialistic than the Treaty of Versailles which was imposed upon the Germans. The German working class did not approve the war-aims of Ludendorff and the Pan-Germans. They began to show distrust in German leadership and it resulted in unrest which later on led to the Revolution.

III

It is not possible to give the details of developments leading to the establishment of the German Republic. However it must be noted that it was Ludendorff who first realized that with the American participation on the battle fronts of France on a large scale, there was no possibility of German victory. With this realization the German General Staff — General Ludendorff—demanded that the German government should take the necessary steps for an armistice at any cost. This demand led to the first stage of the collapse of monarchy in Germany. Prof. Rosenberg writes:

> Ludendorff recognized, moreover, that such a peace move on the part of Germany necessitated an immediate change in the German Government system; for the Entente would not negotiate with the old rulers of Germany. Thus the German confession of collapse must rob those men who had hitherto been Germany's leaders in military and political matters of all their authority. In order to avoid chaos within the country a new Government was essential. Ludendorff now finally decided to give up his dictatorship, and to hand power over to his rival, the only other real authority in the country, the Riechstag. During the week following September 27 (1918) Ludendorff concentrated all his energies on putting power into the hands of the Reichstag. . . . The parliamentarization of Germany was not fought for by the Reichstag; it was arranged by Ludendorff. This kind of revolution is without parallel in the whole history of the world. . . . Ludendorff never sought power in Germany before August, 1916; he had no intention of becoming an autocrat like Caesar or Napoleon I; he became German Dictator because there was no one else who had the courage to command and because he was able to insist on being obeyed. He was utterly devoted to the cause of his country, as he understood it and showed a disinterestedness which is rare among great Dictators. (pp. 241-242.)

Prof. Rosenberg conclusively proves that the German Revolution was a "revolution from above." This was the case at its first stage. However, the mass movement took a more radical turn and went beyond the control of the leaders of the Reichstag, because the leaders did not keep themselves in close contact with the people. He gives intimate details of the treachery of the Austrian court in carrying on separate peace negotiations with the Entente, without any consideration for Germany. He also proves that Prince Max of Baden, as imperial chancellor, gave publicity to the abdication of Kaiser Wilhelm II without his formal authority. Prof. Rosenberg does not give any detail about Kaiser Wilhelm's flight to Holland, but intimates that it was undertaken at the advice of the military leaders of Germany.

When the terms for the Armistice seemed to be too severe, General Ludendorff wished to carry on the fight for a few months with the hope of securing better terms. But the masses were not willing to fight.

This attitude of the masses was regarded as betrayal by many military leaders of Germany. But the fact is that the masses of Germany made all the sacrifice required of them, as long as they were of the opinion that there was any possibility of peace through victory. When it became evident to them that there was no chance of victory, they refused to make further sacrifice.

The German landed aristocracy and military leaders did not show any sign of sympathetic understanding of the aspirations of the German people. They also lacked ability of leadership in the real crisis, resulting from the defeat in the World War. It was the Catholic Centre Party, Democrats and the Social Democrats, who were advocates of a parliamentary government in Germany, found themselves at the head of the German Republic which came out of the great collapse.

The German Revolution passed swiftly through successive stages. The first stage was the establishment of a parliamentary government without the abolition of the monarchy. The second stage was the forced abdication of the Kaiser and the establishment of a regency with the hope of reviving a constitutional monarchy. The third stage was the declaration of the Republic. The fourth stage was the tendency expressed

by a minority for the establishment of a soviet form of government. But this never received popular support and was therefore crushed. The German Revolution was a revolution of the middle-class and therefore it did not take the form of the Russian Revolution.

TARAKNATH DAS.

New York City.

The War Racket

The message of this little book* is from a veteran to (1) his fellow veterans in the world war, and (2) to the American people. The burden of the message is that in this time of unprecedented stress, men and women whose disabilities cannot by any means be associated with their war service are being granted pensions by the people of the land running up into astounding proportions. As this review is written the presidential campaign is drawing to a close. Economy is the main emphasis of the political orators, but so far as memory serves no one of them all, unless it be "Al" Smith, has hinted at economizing in this racketeering raid on the treasury. And yet, as our author points out, and his figures are in agreement with those of the National Economy League as quoted in the New York Times, the largest single item in the present national budget, excepting service on the national debt, is for veterans' relief with a total of $983,000,000. About half of this sum, $452,000,000, is spent in behalf of ex-soldiers whose present disabilities are in no way connected with war service. And the worst of it is that those who are really disabled veterans in the sense in which most of us interpret the term, their widows and children, are neglected and discriminated against in favor of these men, women (nurses), and doctors who, perhaps, for years after the war never discovered that they had any disability whatever.

"Peace Veterans" shows with dramatic and startling accuracy how the present "racket" has grown upon us with the years. "The 1931 report of the Veterans' Administration gives the number of widows benefited by legislation as of June 30, 1931. These were: War of 1812, 8; Mexican War, 547; Indian Wars, 4,302; Civil War, 152,437; Spanish War, 33,427, and World War, 194,861." In addition to this Widows and Orphans "racket" our author lists the Medical "racket," the Officers' "racket," and the "racket" that has grown up around "the Casualties of Peace." Officers are made a preferred class, the size of the pension rated according to the rank of the officer, and this quite without regard either to the disabling character of the disability, or the time when the disability was incurred. Doctors of course are rated as officers, and share in benefits of the officer racket.

And yet in spite of the shamelessness of these various forms of racket, in spite of the terrible burden of taxation made necessary by them, worst of all, in spite of the fact that the real sufferers from the ravages of war, or their surviving dependents, are in real fact discriminated against in favor of these various racketeers, in Congress as well as out.

One wishes that Lieutenant Burlingame had put a scorpion at the end of his whip stinging his readers into a sense of the hellish racket which has made all these others possible, the racket of *war*!

JAMES A. FAIRLEY.

*"Peace Veterans," by Roger Burlinghame. Published by Minton, Balch & Co., New York.

Correspondence

In Praise of Mr. Comfort

Editor of UNITY:

Kindly send me three copies of Oct. 17th UNITY. It is the best for some time. I was indeed thrilled with that beautiful article by one of my special favorites, Will Levington Comfort. How I hope we may be privileged to have more from his inspirational pen. I have passed my copy on and so many people wished to see it I'm going to circulate these others. How timely the article, "British or Bolsheviki." In fact every article was most illuminating. I could not be without UNITY.

Los Angeles, California. ELEANOR WARD.

The Committee for Books for Political Prisoners

Editor of UNITY:

There are over 200 political prisoners in the jails of this country under indictment or sentence for their activities and affiliations with the labor movement. Their terms range from one year to life. Tom Mooney and Warren Billings, the six Centralia men, the Scottsboro boys, and the Harlan, Kentucky miners are numbered among them. An idea of the charges against some of them may be had from the fact that three of those charged with "criminal syndicalism" in Kentucky are local ministers sympathetic with the miners. One was arrested for quoting from the Bible the story of Moses leading the children of Israel out of bondage.

Many of these prisoners have repeatedly written, asking for books and magazines to read to combat the deadly monotony of prison life. The Committee for Books for Political Prisoners has just been organized to take care of their requests and collect and forward books to these men.

Many of your readers have books which they no longer want. Here is an opportunity to put them to good use. If you discover such volumes or magazines in your spring house-cleaning, please send them to the Committee. Books of a serious character on politics, economics, and philosophy are wanted as well as books for entertainment.

Address your packages to the Chairman of the Committee, Mr. George Novack, E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc., 300 Fourth Avenue, New York City. Arrangements can be made to call for packages in New York City.

The Committee for Books for Political Prisoners:
GEORGE NOVACK, *Chairman*
FLORENCE BOWERS,
CLIFTON FADIMAN,
SAMUEL MIDDLEBROOK,
ISIDOR SCHNEIDER.

New York City, N. Y.

Words of Cheer

I

Editor of UNITY:

. . . I wish to acknowledge my indebtedness to your excellent magazine for much of the spiritual food which I absorb. I am wholly in accord with the ideals and policies of your publication and consider it one of the finest magazines of its kind that come to my desk.

New Rochelle, N. Y. (RABBI) S. LUCHS.

II

Editor of UNITY:

. . . I cannot get along without UNITY. It is the most interesting and instructive paper that I know of.

Jackson, Mich. A. F. HUMISTON.

Open Columns

Editor of UNITY:

I believe you are doing a great service to our Fellowship by opening your columns to a frank discussion of contemporary Unitarianism. The Unitarian church has a magnificent opportunity in these days. Some of us see it. Thank you for your courtesy in publishing my small contribution.

Oklahoma City, Okla. HOMER LEWIS SHEFFER.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 130)

e. It decides to ask the Indian National Congress for a representative and to keep in constant touch with the Congress.

f. It decides that patrons are to be chosen by the Executive with first consideration of the list of members of the Provisional Committee.

g. It asks the Executive to study the question of a federal organization or an international union (with open membership) of all friends of India. Until this can be settled, the Executive will keep in touch with interested persons as individual correspondents.

h. It decides that the next Conference will be called in 1933.

II. This Conference pays homage to Mahatma Gandhi and the thousands of Indian men and women, who have so notably demonstrated a new and alternative method to physical warfare in India's struggle for freedom and hails this method as an essential contribution to disarmament.

III. This Conference, while asking for the release of all non-violent prisoners, believes that it is a matter of general principle that political prisoners should not be treated as ordinary criminals. It therefore calls for differential treatment to be accorded to the followers of Mahatma Gandhi, most of whom in their imprisonment are now being associated with criminals and forced to do hard labor.

IV. Endorsement of previous messages:

1. The Conference endorses the terms of the invitation to this Conference with special emphasis on non-violence.

2. The Conference endorses the terms of the message to the League of Nations' delegates.

V. The Congress decides unanimously to elect: Dr. J. T. Sunderland, Romain Rolland and Mrs. Cousins, Honorary Presidents of the Conference as an expression of gratitude for their great service to the cause of India.

"To fly in the air is no miracle, for the dirtiest flies can do it; to cross rivers without bridge or boat is no miracle, for a terrier can do the same; but to help suffering hearts is a miracle performed by holy men."—Sheikh Abdulla Ansar of Herat.

You can turn day into night by electricity, but that does not give you time to think. You can send messages over wires and so on, but such activities may be without discrimination. You have multiplied your bodies in enlarging your national *karma*, and produced suffering in proportion to your discoveries.—From "The Lives of a Bengal Lancer" by F. Yeats-Brown.

. . . from the dimmest period of his history, Man has a feeling that the apparent facts of existence are not final; that his supreme welfare depends upon his being able to remain in perfect relationship with some great mystery beind the veil, at the threshold of a larger life, which is for giving him a far higher value than a mere continuation of his physical li e in the material world."—*Rabindranath Tagore,* in "The Religion of Man."

Help India's struggle for freedom by non-violence! Help us offset British propaganda and meet Gandhi's request for moral support from America.

Join the American League for India's Freedom, John Haynes Holmes, chairman.

Tear off and return:

American League for India's Freedom
383 Bible House
New York City

Count me in as a supporter of India's struggle for independence. Here are my membership dues $.....

Name .....

Date .....Address.....

A Charming Gift Book

THE HEART OF SCOTT'S POETRY

A Selection of the Best Poetry

of Sir Walter Scott

With a Critical Introduction,

By

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

This beautiful volume was prepared and published in recognition of the Scott Centenary (1832-1932)

Price $2.50

Order of your bookseller or of the publishers

Oxford University Press

114 Fifth Avenue **New York City**

Subscribe to

The New Humanist

The November-December issue:

"BOURGEOIS APOLOGIA"
Theodore B. Brameld

"FORTY YEARS OF IT"
Preston Slosson

"CALIFORNIA LANDSCAPE"
Julia N. Budlong

"HUMANISM AND THE EVANGELICAL TRADITION"
F. S. Kinney

"AN AIM FOR AMERICAN EDUCATION"
Brent Dow Allinson

"AN AMERICAN LITERARY FOUNDATION"
Carl Henry Grabo

"THE EVOLUTION OF HUMAN BEHAVIOR"
Maynard Shipley

"KARL BARTH"
Werner Petersman
Harold Buschman

Other Reviews and Notes

SPECIAL

The New Humanist will be sent for one year together with a copy of Joseph Walker's "Humanism as a Way of Life" for $1.75.

Subscription yearly $1.00, single copy 20c.

THE NEW HUMANIST

105 S. Dearborn St., Chicago, Ill.